UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/079,426	02/22/2002	Petri Koskelainen	60282.00294	7008

32294   7590   03/19/2007
SQUIRE, SANDERS & DEMPSEY L.L.P.
14TH FLOOR
8000 TOWERS CRESCENT
TYSONS CORNER, VA 22182

EXAMINER
TAYLOR, NICHOLAS R

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
2141	

SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD OF RESPONSE	MAIL DATE	DELIVERY MODE
3 MONTHS	03/19/2007	PAPER

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire 6 MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.

	Application No.	Applicant(s)
	10/079,426	KOSKELAINEN ET AL.
Office Action Summary	Examiner	Art Unit	
	Nicholas R. Taylor	2141	

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE *3* MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.
- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133).
  Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

1)☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on *20 December 2006*.

2a)☒ This action is **FINAL**. 2b)☐ This action is non-final.

3)☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

4)☒ Claim(s) *60-93* is/are pending in the application.

    4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.

5)☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.

6)☒ Claim(s) *60-93* is/are rejected.

7)☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.

8)☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

9)☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.

10)☒ The drawing(s) filed on *22 February 2002* is/are: a)☒ accepted or b)☐ objected to by the Examiner.

    Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).

    Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).

11)☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

12)☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).

    a)☐ All b)☐ Some * c)☐ None of:

      1.☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.

      2.☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.

      3.☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

    * See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

1)☐ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)

2)☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)

3)☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08)
    Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____.

4)☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413)
    Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____.

5)☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application

6)☐ Other: _____.

DETAILED ACTION

1.   Claims 60-93 have been presented for examination and are rejected.

Response to Arguments

2.   Applicant's arguments filed December 20th, 2006, have been fully considered but they are deemed not persuasive.

3.   In the remarks, applicant argued in substance that:

(A) Prior art of Cook does not teach deciding that a requested specified service is associated with a specific one of said service processing entities of a specific one of said at least one communication network. Cook's system may contain multiple service providers offering the same services, which would prevent unambiguously selecting a specific service.

        As to point (A), Cook teaches a terminal that requests service that is satisfied by an analyzing entity providing communication with a specific service processing entity in a specific network (col. 3, lines 15-67). The terminal device requests a specific service and the analyzing entity fulfills this request by selecting a specific service processing entity of a specific network (col. 14, lines 44-50; see fig. 14, steps 1212, 1214, and 1218). Cook provides service access to a "plurality of communication networks" –a group that may vary in the composition of service providers (col. 3, lines 15-23).

Additionally, the requirement that each communication network may only provide

services that are unique to the specific network is not recited in the claimed limitations.

(B) Prior art of Cook does not teach a terminal requesting a specified service.

Rather, the access server generates a query to the terminal, the terminal provides a

reply, and the server provides a list of available services.

As to point (B), Cook provides the list of available services to the user terminal

based on the user's capabilities (col. 14, lines 40-44). Afterwards, the terminal requests

a specific service and thereafter routes communication messages to the destination

communication network (col. 14, lines 44-50).

(C) Prior art of Cook does not teach routing communication messages

associated with said terminal via said analyzing entity to said specific one of said

service processing entities within said specified communication network. Rather, the

user is simply connected to a specific service network.

As to point (C), the analyzing entity of Cook validates and performs security

services to authenticate users connected to the system (see access network 520 in col.

9, lines 29-33). Afterwards, the entity creates a "network shell" that manages the

user/terminal interaction with the service processing destinations on the plurality of

networks (col. 9, lines 30-40). More specifically, Cook's analyzing entity routes the

communication messages by waiting next packet from the user, followed by

"exchang[ing] packets between the network device and the selected service provider" (col. 14, lines 40-50).

(D) Prior art of Cook does not teach each network being equipped with service processing entities, but merely teaches a variety of networks such as a PSTN, the internet, public data networks, and private data networks.

As to point (D), Cook teaches accessing communication networks that contain service processing entities, where each is an "entity that provides communication services to users who are accessing the service through an access provider" (col. 10, lines 18-20).

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102

4.   The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless –

(e) the invention was described in (1) an application for patent, published under section 122(b), by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent or (2) a patent granted on an application for patent by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent, except that an international application filed under the treaty defined in section 351(a) shall have the effects for purposes of this subsection of an application filed in the United States only if the international application designated the United States and was published under Article 21(2) of such treaty in the English language.

5.   Claims 60-63, 66-77, 80-87, 90, and 91 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as being anticipated by Cook (U.S. Patent 6,697,806).

6.   As per claims 60, 74, 90, 91, 92, and 93, Cook teaches a method comprising the

steps of:

requesting, by a terminal, a specified service to be at a disposition of said

terminal, wherein the terminal is configured to perform communication via at least one

communication network, each network being equipped with service processing entities;

(Cook, col. 9, lines 4-12; fig. 5 items 512, 562, 564)

analyzing said request by an analyzing entity associated with said at least one

communication network, (Cook, col. 9, lines 30-41)

said analyzing entity configured to be associable with a plurality of

communication networks; (Cook, col. 8, lines 49-65; see overview of fig. 5 with multiple

networks including items 530 and 540)

deciding, by said analyzing entity, that said requested specified service is

associated a service processing entity of a specific one of said at least one

communication network, and (Cook, col. 9, lines 30-41)

in response to said decision, routing communication messages associated with

said terminal via said analyzing entity to said specific one of said service processing

entities within said specified communication network (Cook, where message routing is

described in col. 14, lines 44-50; see fig. 12 process steps 1212, 1214, 1216, and

1218).

7.   As per claims 61 and 75, Cook teaches the system further wherein the

requesting said specified service comprises indicating said specified service in a

request message (Cook, col. 17, lines 38-44; col. 17, line 59 to col. 18, line 4; see also

fig. 16 steps 1604, 1608, and 1612).

8.   As per claims 62 and 76, Cook teaches the system further wherein the indicating

said specified service comprises carrying by a service identifier in said request message

(Cook, col. 17, lines 38-44; col. 17, line 59 to col. 18, line 4; see also fig. 16 steps 1604,

1608, and 1612).

9.   As per claims 63 and 77, Cook teaches the system further wherein carrying said

identifier comprises carrying the identifier in the user data payload in said request

message (Cook, col. 17, lines 38-44; fig. 16).

10.   As per claims 66 and 80, Cook teaches the system further wherein said request

message comprises at least a subscriber identifier (Cook, fig. 16 item 1608).

11.   As per claims 67 and 81, Cook teaches the system further comprising:

        detecting that said request message does not comprise a service identifier; and

        in response thereto, retrieving said service identifier based on said subscriber

identifier from a database entity (Cook, col. 17, lines 45-58; see fig. 16, decision branch

starting at step 1604 with the answer NO; see also database system of fig. 6).

12.   As per claims 68 and 82, Cook teaches the system further comprising configuring

said service identifier to comprise at least one of a network code and a service code

(Cook, col. 17, lines 38-44; col. 17, line 59 to col. 18, line 4; see also fig. 16 steps 1604,

1608, and 1612).

13.   As per claims 69 and 83, Cook teaches the system further comprising configuring

said service identifier to comprise at least one of a network code and a service code

(Cook, col. 17, lines 38-44; col. 17, line 59 to col. 18, line 4; see also fig. 16 steps 1604,

1608, and 1612).

14.   As per claims 70 and 84, Cook teaches the system further comprising configuring

said network code to represent a respective one of said communication networks

(Cook, col. 17, lines 38-44; col. 17, line 59 to col. 18, line 4; see also fig. 16 steps 1604,

1608, and 1612, wherein the identifier represents the service provider at the destination

network).

15.   As per claim 71 and 85, Cook teaches the system further comprising configuring

said service code to represent a respective one of the services to be processed at the

corresponding service processing entity (Cook, col. 17, lines 38-44; col. 17, line 59 to

col. 18, line 4; see also fig. 16 steps 1604, 1608, and 1612).

16.   As per claims 72 and 86, Cook teaches the system further comprising configuring

said communication networks to be distinguishable by at least one of the network type

and the network operator (Cook, col. 9, lines 29-41, wherein service communication is

handled specific to the network type).

17.   As per claims 73 and 87, Cook teaches the system further comprising configuring

said services to be distinguishable by at least one of the terminal type, subscriber

identifier, subscriber profiles, manufacturer of the terminal, capabilities of the terminal or

vendor of the terminal (Cook, col. 9, lines 29-41, e.g. when terminal capabilities and the

subscriber profiles are used).

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

18.   The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all

obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

> (a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set
> forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and
> the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the
> invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains.
> Patentability shall not be negatived by the manner in which the invention was made.

19.   Claims 64, 65, 78, and 79 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being

unpatentable over Cook (U.S. Patent 6,697,806) and Davis et al. (US PGPub

2003/0041146).

20.   As per claims 64 and 78, Cook teaches the above, yet fails to teach wherein said

carrying said identifier comprises carrying the identifier in a header of said request

message.

Davis teaches a connection allocation method (Davis, paragraph 0019) that uses

service codes representing services via message headers (Davis, paragraph 0049 &

0052, figure 2).

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art, at the time the

invention was made, to have combined Cook and Davis to provide the service code

headers of Davis in the system of Cook, because doing so would allow intelligent and

high speed connection decisions providing enhanced network services (Davis,

paragraph 0018).

21.   As per claims 65 and 79, Cook teaches the above, yet fails to teach piggybacking

said identifier to said header.

Davis teaches a connection allocation method (Davis, paragraph 0019) that uses

service codes representing services via message headers (Davis, paragraph 0049 &

0052, figure 2).

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art, at the time the

invention was made, to have combined Cook and Davis to provide the service code

headers of Davis in the system of Cook, because doing so would allow intelligent and

high speed connection decisions providing enhanced network services (Davis,

paragraph 0018).

22.   Claims 88 and 89 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable

over Cook (U.S. Patent 6,697,806)) and Nguyen et al. (US PGPub 2003/0005132).

23.   As per claims 88 and 89, Cook teaches the above, yet fails to teach wherein said

request message is configured to be transported using the session initiation protocol

(SIP).

Nguyen teaches a network with multiple service processing entities selectable for

communication within the network (Nguyen, paragraphs 0029-0030 and figure 2) for

service requests that use the Session Initiation Protocol (Nguyen, paragraphs 0068-

0070).

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art, at the time the

invention was made, to have combined Cook and Nguyen to provide the multiple

services of Nguyen in the system of Cook, because doing so would decrease

management and maintenance requirements while improving scalability (Cook,

paragraph 0007) and enable the use of the Session Initiation Protocol to achieve

services such as Voice Over Internet Protocol (Cook, paragraph 0069).

Conclusion

24.   **THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL.** Applicant is reminded of the extension of time

policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire THREE

MONTHS from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within

TWO MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not

mailed until after the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the

shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any

extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of

the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later

than SIX MONTHS from the date of this final action.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the

examiner should be directed to Nicholas Taylor whose telephone number is (571) 272-

3889. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday-Friday, 8:00am to 5:30pm,

with alternating Fridays off.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's

supervisor, Rupal Dharia can be reached on (571) 272-3880. The fax phone number

for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is (571) 273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the

Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for

published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR.

Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only.

For more information about the PAIR system, see http://pair-direct.uspto.gov. Should

you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic

Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

Nicholas Taylor
Examiner
Art Unit 2141

RUPAL DHARIA
SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER